



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,472	09/15/2003	Binod P. Gangadharan	063435-413715	3749

66083 7590 09/28/2010

Polsinelli Shughart PC
on behalf of Oracle America, Inc.
700 West 47th Street
Suite 1000
Kansas City, MO 64112

EXAMINER

HENRY, MARIEGEORGES A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2455

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

09/28/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspt@polsinelli.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/663,472	Applicant(s) GANGADHARAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Marie Georges Henry	Art Unit 2455	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 29-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the amendment filed on 6/30/2010. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, and 29-31 are pending. Claims 1 -3, 5-7, 9-10, and 29-31 are related to frameworks for integrating information systems.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, ff the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a

Art Unit: 2455

whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Starkovich** et al (hereinafter "Starkovich") (**US 6, 993, 585 B1**) in view of **DeLuca** et al. (**US 7, 549, 124 B2**).

Regarding claim 1, Starkovich a method of connecting an application server to an information system, said method comprising:

providing, utilizing a hardware application server, a generic connector interface on said hardware application server (Starkovich, column 7, lines 41- 42, fig. 4, a generic gateway is disclosed in a NT server),

receiving information related to an information system at said hardware application server, said information system having a first interface, said information system accessible utilizing said first interface (Starkovich, column 6, lines 34-39, fig. 1 a Distributed Transaction Processing is transmitting data and status information to a Transaction Gateway client);

Art Unit: 2455

generating, utilizing said hardware application server, a customized connector interface on said hardware application server by modifying said generic connector interface based on said received information by:

wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system (Starkovich, column 8, lines 38-47, fig.6, clients of a WebTx access enterprise applications using a processing information made of custom gateway).

Although Starkovich discloses a feature to built customer own gateway to interface own application, he does not explicitly disclose the generic connector interface comprising a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file; adding said first interface to the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file, and creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file; and connecting, utilizing said hardware application server, said information system to said hardware application server via said customized connector interface utilizing the Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file.

DeLuca discloses the generic connector interface comprising a Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file (DeLuca, column 10, lines 30-32, a management interface has the ability to change configuration by polling selected one);

DeLuca discloses a method adding said first interface to the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file (DeLuca, column 10, lines 28-29, a interface is disclosed being polled and managed by a management interface), and creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file (DeLuca, column 13, lines 53-57, a schema file is standardized by using a scriptable file language of a translation engine on a management tool) ; and

connecting, utilizing said hardware application server, said information system to said hardware application server via said customized connector interface utilizing the Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file, (DeLuca, column 9, lines 42-46, a WBEM-compliant interface, such as Microsoft Corporation's windows Management Instrument, is used in order to deliver a set of standard management tools to tailor interface components).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate DeLuca interface management tool into Starkovich generic connection for integrating information systems in order to create generic connection for information systems with an interface management tool in order to reduce substantially user intervention when modifying an interface (DeLuca, column 2, lines 28-30).

Art Unit: 2455

Regarding claim 2, Starkovich and DeLuca disclose the method as recited in claim 1, wherein said providing of a generic connector interface comprises providing a software package (Starkovich, column 8, lines 34-37, Gateway interface customer own application to an OLTP enterprise application).

Regarding claim 3, Starkovich and DeLuca the method as recited in claim 2, wherein said information system is a relational database that is compliant with a Java DataBase Connection (JDBC) architecture (Starkovich, column 7, lines 66-67, class definitions used are JavaGate compatible).

Regarding claim 5, Starkovich and DeLuca the method as recited in claim 1.

Although Starkovich discloses a feature to built customer own gateway to interface own application, he does not explicitly disclose a feature wherein modifying the deployment descriptor comprises editing at least one of a server Name, a port number, a user name, a password, a database name, a data source name, a description, a network protocol, a role name, a login timeout, driver properties, a delimiter, or a class name.

DeLuca discloses the method wherein modifying the deployment descriptor comprises editing at least one of a server Name, a port number, a user name, a password, a database name, a data source name, a description, a network protocol, a

Art Unit: 2455

role name, a login timeout, driver properties, a delimiter, or a class name (DeLuca, column 13, lines 60-65, one of the filed of the scripted file includes Server Name).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate DeLuca interface management tool into Starkovich generic connection for integrating information systems in order to create generic connection for information systems with an interface management tool in order to reduce substantially user intervention when modifying an interface (DeLuca, column 2, lines 28-30).

Regarding claim 6, Starkovich and DeLuca the method as recited in claim 1, wherein said receiving of information related to said information system comprises: receiving one or more parameters (Starkovich, column 8, lines 38-39, key software component are part of the access relationship between a WebTx and enterprise applications).

Regarding claim 7, Starkovich and DeLuca the method as recited in claim 6, wherein said receiving of information related to said information system further comprises receiving said one or more parameters as input through a Graphical User Interface (GUI) (Starkovich, column 7, lines 44-47, data is received in a format that is understandable by a URL).

Art Unit: 2455

Regarding claim 29, Starkovich a computer readable medium including computer program code for connecting an application server to an information system, said computer readable medium comprising:

computer program code, stored in at least one computer readable medium and executable by at least one processing unit, for providing a generic connector interface (Starkovich, column 7, lines 41- 42, fig. 4, a generic gateway is disclosed in a NT server),

computer program code, stored in the at least one computer readable medium and executable by the at least one processing unit, for receiving information related to an information system, said information system having a first interface, said information system accessible utilizing said first interface (Starkovich, column 6, lines 34-39, fig. 1 a Distributed Transaction Processing is transmitting data and status information to a Transaction Gateway client);

computer program code, stored in the at least one computer readable medium and executable by the at least one processing unit (Starkovich, column 5, lines 1-5, a storage feature is disclosed), for generating a customized connector interface by modifying said generic connector interface based on said received information, wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system (Starkovich, column 8, lines 38-47, fig.6, clients of a WebTx access enterprise applications using a processing

Art Unit: 2455

information made of custom gateway).

Although Starkovich discloses a feature to built customer own gateway to interface own application, he does not explicitly disclose the generic connector interface Comprising a Generic Resource Adapter Archive (GRAR) file; adding said first interface to the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file, and creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file; and computer program code, stored in the at least one computer readable medium and executable by the at least one processing unit, for connecting said information system to said application server via said customized connector interface utilizing the Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR)file.

DeLuca discloses the generic connector interface Comprising a Generic Resource Adapter Archive (GRAR) file (DeLuca, column 10, lines 30-32, a management interface has the ability to change configuration by polling selected one); by adding said first interface to the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file (DeLuca, column 10, lines 28-29, a interface is disclosed being polled and managed by a management interface), and

creating a Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR) file by modifying a deployment descriptor of the Generic Resource Adaptor Archive (GRAR) file (DeLuca, column 13, lines 53-57, a schema file is standardized by using a scriptable file language of a translation engine on a management tool); and

computer program code, stored in the at least one computer readable medium and executable by the at least one processing unit, for connecting said information system to said application server via said customized connector interface utilizing the Customized Resource Adaptor Archive (CRAR)file (DeLuca, column 9, lines 42-46, a WBEM-compliant interface, such as Microsoft Corporation's windows Management Instrument, is used in order to deliver a set of standard management tools to tailor interface components).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate DeLuca interface management tool into Starkovich generic connection for integrating information systems in order to create generic connection for information systems with an interface management tool in order to reduce substantially user intervention when modifying an interface (DeLuca, column 2, lines 28-30).

Regarding claim 30, Starkovich and DeLuca the computer readable medium as recited in claim 29, wherein said computer programming code, stored in at least one computer readable medium and executable by at least one processing unit, for providing a generic connector interface comprises: providing a software package (Starkovich, column 8, lines 34-37, Gateway interface own application to an OLTP enterprise application is disclosed).

Art Unit: 2455

Regarding claim 31, Starkovich and DeLuca the computer readable medium as recited in claim 30, wherein said information system is a relational database is compliant with a Java DataBase Connection (JDBC) architecture (Starkovich, column 7, lines 60-67, WebTx system having a Java Libraries available and using a software development is disclosed).

5. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Starkovich**, in view of **DeLuca**, and further in view of **Ng (US 6, 411, 956 B1)**.

Regarding claim 9, Starkovich and DeLuca the method as recited in claim 1.

Although Starkovich and DeLuca disclose the feature to built customer own gateway to interface own application, they do not disclose the feature wherein said connecting of said information system to said hardware application server comprises: encapsulating said first interface by a second interface that is implemented after said generic connector interface is customized.

Ng discloses the feature wherein said connecting of said information system to said hardware application server comprises: encapsulating said first interface by a second interface that is implemented after said generic connector interface is customized (Ng, column 3, lines 40-44, instead of creating a new physical database connection for each connection request a global transaction identifier is used in order to

Art Unit: 2455

make the connection).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate DeLuca interface management tool and flexible connection feature into Starkovich generic connection for integrating information method in order to create generic connection for information method with an interface management tool and flexible connection feature in order to reduce substantially user intervention when modifying an interface (DeLuca, column 2, lines 28-30) and to permit a transparent translation between different communication protocols.

Regarding claim 10, Starkovich and DeLuca the method as recited in claim 1.

Although Starkovich discloses the feature to built customer own gateway to interface own application, he does not explicitly disclose the feature wherein generating a customized connector interface comprises: generating a second interface that can encapsulate the first interface.

Ng discloses the feature wherein generating a customized connector interface comprises: generating a second interface that can encapsulate the first interface (Ng, column 3, lines 40-44, instead of creating a new physical database connection for second connection request a global transaction identifier is used in order to make the connection).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate DeLuca interface management tool and Ng flexible connection feature into Starkovich generic connection for integrating information method in order to create generic connection for information method with an interface management tool and a flexible connection feature in order to reduce substantially user intervention when modifying an interface (DeLuca, column 2, lines 28-30) and to permit a transparent translation between different communication protocols.

6. The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Melero et al. (US 2003/0088 362 A1) is made part of the record because of the teaching of interface. Barinov et al. (US 2008/032 0496 A1) is made part of the record because of the teaching of updating drivers. Lee et al. (US 2008/0263 653 A1) is made part of the record because of the teaching of reconfiguring connections in database drivers.

Response to Argument

7. The argument raised in the response filed on June 9, 2010 will be summarized and addressed as followed:

Art Unit: 2455

Applicant argues in substance that: A) Starkovich does not disclose in claims 1 and 29 "generating, utilizing said hardware application server, a customized connector interface on said hardware application server by modifying said generic connector interface based on said information received by...wherein said customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system"(Remark, page 5, lines 24-29; page 6, lines 8-18).

In response to A; Starkovich discloses;

34) The GGATE 72 is **a generic gateway** which performs tasks which are grouped into conceptual areas. It receives service requests from the adapters and takes whatever action is necessary to fulfill the request. This typically involves **transforming a request** (such as a URL from a Web Browser or remote procedure calls RPC's from a DCOM client) **into a format which is understandable by a Distributed Transaction Processing System** such as **a Unisys 2200 Enterprise System 200**. GGATE 72 also transforms data returned from the Distributed Transaction Processing System 200 into a formatted response which is returned to the requestor **(column 7, lines 41-51)**.

A Custom Gateway, such as shown at 264, provide a way for a customer to **build their own Gateway to interface their own applications** to an OLTP enterprise application. (40) FIG. 6 is a diagram showing the relationship of the key software components of WebTx which allow clients to access enterprise applications. **The Unisys ClearPath IX Server 310** includes both an **OS 2200 environment 312** and a **Windows NT environment 314**. All ClearPath HMP IX Servers 310 include **On-Line Transaction Processing (OLTP) software that complies with the X/Open model for Distributed Transaction Processing (DTP)**. This enables client/server access to existing OLTP applications as well as allowing

Art Unit: 2455

development of new, distributed client/server applications.
(**column 8, lines 34-48**).

As cited in paragraph above, the limitation of “generating, utilizing said hardware application server, a customized connector interface on said hardware application server” is taught by the reference. Starkovich discloses a custom Gateway that builds own Gateway to interface own application on a Unisys IX server (Starkovich, column 8, lines 34-48).

The limitation of “modifying said generic connector interface based on said information received” is taught by the reference. Starkovich discloses that a request is transformed into a format which is understandable by a distributed Transaction Processing system (Starkovich, column 7, lines 41-51).

The limitation of “customized connector interface provides access to said information system through said first interface of said information system” is taught by the reference. Starkovich discloses that at a generic gate way a request is transformed in to a format that is understandable by a processing system (Starkovich, column 8, lines 34-48).

Therefore, in Starkovich, a Custom Gateway building own Gateway to Interface own application was equated to a customized connector interface, a Unisys ClearPath IX

Art Unit: 2455

Server, transforming a request into a format which is understandable by a Distributed Transaction Processing System was equated to modifying said generic connector interface based on said information received, and a Unisys ClearPath IX Server was equated to a hardware application server meet the claim limitations.

Applicant argues in substance that: B) "Ng does not cure the defects of Starkovich as Ng only generally relates to a method for distributed transaction support using JDBC drivers, not generating a customized connector interface by modifying a generic connector interface" in claims 9 and 10 (Remark, page 7, lines 24-29).

In response to B; in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Starkovich's reference teaches a generic connection for integrating information, DeLucas' reference discloses an interface management tool, and Ng's reference teaches flexible connection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Marie Georges Henry whose telephone number is (571) 270-3226. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30am - 4:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status

Art Unit: 2455

of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marie Georges Henry/

Examiner, Art Unit 2455

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455